



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mate question would be whether, as Scherillo thinks, it is purely accidental.¹³ Considering the other elements of symmetry in this book where every effect is carefully calculated, and considering that there was not one chance in a thousand of so much symmetry as even this minimum being hit upon unintentionally, I agree with Federzoni that to deny Dante's intention is "proprio senza senso." This does not in itself involve any particular system of interpreting the book. Personally, I do not care for the term "forma architettonica," and I think that the idea of symmetry is pushed too far by some writers. But on the other hand, the fact that it was observed by visionaries like Rossetti and Aroux does not *necessarily* prove, as Scherillo implies (p. 376), that the whole proposition is visionary. It is noteworthy that Cesareo, without mentioning the symmetrical arrangement, speaks of the predominance of the three *canzoni* in words similar to those of Rossetti.¹⁴ The critics who agree in this matter with Scherillo—except Scherillo himself, who has treated me most courteously—do not appear to have taken the trouble to read my paper and weigh my arguments.¹⁵ I ven-

ture to hope that, since through the publication of Scherillo's admirable edition the matter has again been brought forward, the facts in the case will become generally recognized, and the symmetrical structure of the *Vita Nuova* will be permitted to enlighten us as to various problems connected with this book, and as to Dante's method of composition.

KENNETH MCKENZIE.

Yale University.

English Drama of the Restoration and Eighteenth Century (1642-1780). By GEORGE HENRY NETTLETON. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1914.

This work, of over three hundred pages exclusive of bibliography and index, forms our first exhaustive study of English dramatic literature for the years between 1642 and 1780. Though Sir A. W. Ward and Mr. Gosse have both done valuable work on eighteenth century drama, the unpleasant nature as well as the mediocrity of many plays within the period has discouraged most critics. Professor Nettleton in his work has depended at times upon the criticisms of his distinguished predecessors, but he also has added much to their researches.

The plan of the work is historical, with a grouping of plays and authors chiefly according to the types of drama successively in vogue. A brief sketch of the relations existing between Elizabethan and Restoration drama reveals at the outset Professor Nettleton's interest in the English elements of our drama as distinct from various foreign influences. In view of the usual assumption that after 1660 English

¹³ I am totally unable to comprehend Cochin's note (*op. cit.*, p. vi): "Quelques critiques, et notamment des Américains, ont pensé pouvoir attribuer au livre une architecture méthodique . . . on rencontrerait [!] d'abord dix poèmes courts—puis une grande chanson," etc. Does the French critic doubt the figures?

¹⁴ Cesareo, *op. cit.*, p. xv: "Nelle tre grandi canzoni che, quasi colonne centrali, sostengono l'armioso edificio della *Vita Nuova*," etc.; cf. p. xxxix. Quotations from Rossetti in my article and in Scherillo's *poscritto*.

¹⁵ F. Flamini, reviewing Cochin in the *Rassegna Bibliog. d. Lett. Ital.*, XVII, 7, remarks: "Giustamente, proseguendo, il Cochin s'associa allo Scherillo nell'escludere lo schematismo, l' 'architettura metodica' attribuita alla *Vita Nuova* da taluni critici, specialmente americani." See notes 11, 13 and 14, above. The only Americans who have written on this subject, so far as I know, are Prof. Norton and myself. Zingarelli, *Dante*, p. 729 (1903, before the publication of my paper), decided that Scherillo "ha finalmente dimostrato assurdo lo schema simmetrico escogitato da C. E. Norton." Melodia, *op. cit.*, p. xlvii, cites my paper, but appears not to have read

it, since he proposes as his own discovery the second scheme of division which I, following Prof. Norton, had carefully explained (to say nothing of Federzoni). Melodia does not definitely declare his opinion: "Nessuno dei disegni escogitati appare così regolare o così chiaro da togliere il dubbio che Dante ad esso abbia pensato."

drama drew largely upon continental originals, this new angle of approach lends an added interest to the work. Following this preliminary chapter with some facts regarding the dramatic affairs of the Commonwealth, Professor Nettleton then proceeds in successive chapters to give accounts of the various forms in vogue down to 1780. In some instances changes in current opinion, such as the events leading to the Licensing Act, supply topics for chapter headings, but usually the plays discussed are centered about the influence of a few dramatists in the development of a type.

The writers presented thus have not, however, received exhaustive study. Full lists of their works are not given, but only such biographical details as have a relation to the type of drama under discussion. This form of exposition has been made familiar through the *Cambridge History of English Literature*, where its merits and defects are most apparent. In Professor Nettleton's work one might wish that such figures as Colley Cibber and Aaron Hill had been treated more fully for the sake of a clearer account of theatrical conditions; for such information one must depend upon casual references. In the case of such well-known figures as Congreve, Steele, Goldsmith, and Sheridan, no such complaint can be made, for the familiar facts regarding their plays are well fitted into the review of the entire period. Particular praise, too, is due the chapter on Etherege and Wycherley for the careful estimate made of these secondary figures. If one is dissatisfied with the sketchy form of the brief studies of many minor dramatists, he may well remember that the clearness of the whole depends largely upon such suppression of the unessentials.

Professor Nettleton offers some new views on several stock topics of discussion. He sees in Francis Quarles' *The Virgin Widow* (printed 1649) a new claimant for the honor of having introduced rimed verse into the drama of the century, but he still credits Dryden with the establishment of the vogue. A more important contribution to criticism lies in the suggestion concerning one source for sentimental comedy. The author sees in the

comedies of Steele and of his successors in this field an imitation of the emotional appeal that existed earlier in the "tragedies of pity" written by Otway and Southerne. A plausible case is made out for this influence of a dramatic type upon another kind of play, and in this source-work Professor Nettleton has made his best point for English materials in English drama in place of supposed continental originals. A similar plea might be made for the influence of the "love-and-honor" debates of heroic tragedy upon sentimental comedy, for though the older type is more vigorous in its emotional appeal, it is equally analytical. The form of appeal is surely similar, but perhaps the relationship is less apparent than in the other instances. At least Professor Nettleton's suggestion has opened the way for a new study of the origins of sentimental comedy as a type owing much to earlier English drama.

But it is in the denial of a strong French influence upon early Restoration drama that the author departs most decisively from older criticism. In considering the Restoration drama, Professor Nettleton's method has been to enforce the relationships known to exist between Elizabethan and Restoration drama by asserting that Jonson, Beaumont, and Fletcher were far more influential fundamentally than Corneille and Racine. He effectively presents an account of the drolls of the Interregnum as one proof of an uninterrupted English tradition, and his conclusions are most reasonable.

Some matters of interest have possibly received less consideration than one desires in a work of literary history. For instance, would it have been impossible, following Dr. Ward's example, to give terse summaries of the most important plots? Such summaries appear in the text occasionally, but in the case of plays so rarely read—and often so unfit for reading—one wishes that this aid had been granted more freely to the casual student. At least full plot outlines might well have been given of typical plays; one could then get definite notions concerning the qualities of reformed, "humor," and sentimental comedies without close reading of several plays. Even the ad-

vanced student would have welcomed such summaries of plots that are often vague and unwieldy. If other additions would not have made an unduly large work, one would have appreciated separate chapters on the history of the theatres and dramatic companies, as well as much more fact regarding the importance of stage properties in an eighteenth century play-house. Undoubtedly these topics are in themselves broad enough for separate studies, as are such topics as the political dramas of the thirties, or the runs of pantomime, opera, and burlesque. Much of this extraneous material can be found in Watson Nicholson's *The Struggle for a Free Stage in London*, and in a recent book on Aaron Hill by Miss Dorothy Brewster; but the general survey still remains unwritten. Undoubtedly Professor Nettleton himself possesses much unpublished information on the circumstances of dramatic production during the eighteenth century, so that further studies may follow his present publication.

The net result of reading this valuable study is a feeling that much more must be done before authoritative opinions can be expected on matters of secondary interest. In the words of the author, one admits that "convenient generalizations must not be mistaken for fixed laws governing dramatic development," and it is through incisive attack upon some of these groundless generalizations that Professor Nettleton has done excellent service. His uniform refusal to generalize too freely from his own conclusions gives his work an authority that it could have gained in no other fashion, and it is for such conservatism as well as for stimulating suggestions concerning sources that one must consider this study of importance. Moreover, the brief critical bibliographies will furnish fit guidance for students beginning work in the period.

DAVID HARRISON STEVENS.

University of Chicago.

French Prophets of Yesterday: A Study of Religious Thought under the Second Empire, by ALBERT LÉON GUÉRARD. New York, Appleton, 1913. 288 pp.

An excellent piece of work! The plan of Professor Guérard's book has been well conceived, and as well executed. A study of the most important period of French literature of the nineteenth century in the light of its religious history, or rather, evolution, it has both an historical and a philosophical value. In answering the question, "Why is the anti-religious spirit predominant in France to-day?" the author analyses the religious tendencies and evolution of representative writers, whom he groups, adopting the three states of Comte, under the standards of theology, metaphysics, and positivism. He has focussed his attention on the period of twenty-two years (1851-1871) during which Louis Napoleon, as president and emperor, was the ruler of France, a period of which it is possible to give an historical survey, because it is far enough removed from us for the principles involved not to be obscured by the smoke of controversy.

Having stated the problem and its possible solution, the author devotes a liberal allowance of space to the Catholic writers. Few and insignificant factors in literature as they are, they were as a house divided, on account of the fatal part politics exercised on the religious life of France under the second empire, when the pass-word among the orthodox Catholics was "absolutism in politics, and infallibility in religion." The present political situation in France is only one of many examples of the reaction which comes as a result of the unholy pact between church and state. Professor Guérard undertakes to explain the present hostile intellectual and spiritual attitude. In his analysis of Catholic writers of such varied tendencies and temperaments as Baudelaire, Maret, Gratry, Hello, Veuillot and Montalembert, he shows how they were rewarded and condemned by their ecclesiastical superiors in proportion to their fervidness for the cause of Ultramontanism and against a compromise with